



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/493,783	01/28/2000	James D. Schlick	KT-001AX	2657

7590

06/03/2002

Weingarten Schurgin Gagebin & Hayes LLP
Ten Post Office Square
Boston, MA 02109

EXAMINER

ROBERTSON, DAVID

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3623

14

DATE MAILED: 06/03/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/493,783

Applicant(s)

SCHLICK ET AL.

Examiner

Dave Robertson

Art Unit

3623

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 August 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-111 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-111 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 28 January 2000 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 5,9,11,12.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to a preliminary amendment adding claims 4-111, the amendment filed 8/28/2000 prior to first action on the merits. Claims 1-111 are pending for examination.

2. An overview of the claims is presented here, of which:

Claims 1-3 recite broadly, an automated process, computer program product, and apparatus for information processing related to a complex business situation. Claims 4-111, in two sets of 54 claims each, recite processes (claims 4-57) and computer program product (claims 58-111) for information processing related to a complex business situation. All claims are directed to a process of problem solving and decision-making using automated means for gathering, storing, presenting, and analyzing information.

Claims 4-111, added by preliminary amendment, were carefully reviewed against the original disclosure with the finding that certain claims introduced new matter. New matter is addressed in 35 U.S.C. 112 rejections in this office action.

Claims 4-57 and 58-111 recite parallel limitations, having essentially the same elements in corresponding claims; however, the two sets of claims do not have parallel relative dependencies. That is, claims 4-20 differ at claims 9, 16, and 20 in dependency relation to claims of the first set, claims 58-74, as compared to claims 63, 70, and 74 in relation to the claims of the second set, claims 58-111. (Claims 21-57 are fully parallel (elements and dependencies) with claims 75-111.) Accordingly, an allowance indicated on a dependent claim in one claim set may not be indicated in the corresponding claim of the other. If it was

Art Unit: 3623

Applicant's intent to recite fully parallel claims for the process and computer program product claims then amendment by Applicant may be warranted.

Restriction

3. Restriction was considered due to the different statutory classes of invention (process and product) but was deemed improper due to the obviousness of a computer program product performing substantially the same function over the automated process. The inventions were deemed obvious over one another and, aside from the quantity of claims made, the burden of search minimal.

Information Disclosures and Rule 105 Requests for Information

4. A protest against issuance of a patent based upon this application was been filed under 37 CFR 1.291(a) on 7/30/2001 and a copy served on Applicant. Applicant's Comment on Protest received 8/27/2001 complies with the requirement made in the correspondence mailed 8/10/01 that any comments before consideration of the protest be filed within 1 month of mailing. Accordingly, Applicant's comments have been considered.

5. Information Disclosure Statements Form PTO-1449 of record as of the date of this action (papers #5, #8, #11, and #12), including those filed by third party protest filed (July 30, 2002) have been considered as indicated on initialed and attached forms PTO-1449.

6. Applicant and the assignee of this application are required under 37 CFR 1.105 to provide the following information that the examiner has determined is reasonably necessary for the examination of this application.

In view of various court proceedings involving the assignee of the instant invention and competitors in the assignee's art, it is apparent that alleged infringing materials in at least one

Art Unit: 3623

proceeding may read on the invention, materials which are not currently available for review during examination. Specifically, in *KEPNER-TREGOE v LEADERSHIP SOFTWARE* (29 USPQ2d 1747), assignee of the instant application *Kepner-Tregoe, Inc.* alleges copyright infringement by a computer program for sale by defendant *Leadership Software, Inc.*

In *KEPNER-TREGOE*, the computer program *Managing Participation in Organizations* is alleged to infringe on the copyright of Kepner-Tregoe for a process of decision making described as the *Vroom/Jago* model. In another case, *KEPNER-TREGOE v VROOM* (CA 2) 51 USPQ2d 1771), assignee alleges copyright infringement over materials used to teach managers to make better decisions. It is believed that the process underlying the instant invention is, in whole or in part, the process at issue in each in these proceedings.

The indication of existence of the computer program *Managing Participation in Organizations* at the time of the proceedings suggests that Applicant or assignee may be in possession or in a position to gain possession of relevant prior art documents describing the above-named computer program. Applicant is requested to provide all documents in possession regarding the computer program *Managing Participation in Organizations* and other materials relevant to this line of inquiry.

In *KEPNER-TREGOE v EXECUTIVE DEVELOPMENT* (276 F.3d577; 2001 U.S. App. LEXIS 26742), assignee of the instant application Kepner-Tregoe alleges copyright infringement by a computer program for sale or use by defendant Executive Development, Inc. (EDI). In the case, defendant's *Decision Focus materials and software* are alleged to infringe on the copyrights of Kepner-Tregoe for works APEX II and GENCO II.

A comparison of the works of Kepner-Tregoe and EDI (see page 3 of the decision) demonstrates a marked similarity between the works and DECISION FOCUS, and a strong resemblance to the process underlying the instant invention. It is unclear from the proceedings whether APEX II and GENCO II are computer programs commensurate with the DECISION FOCUS software or whether the comparison was made between manual processes. However, it is clear that the works APEX II and GENCO II may contain information relevant to the examination of the instant invention, as the works have been compared to a computer program alleged to have implemented the works bearing similarities to the instant invention. Applicant is requested to provide documents describing the works APEX II and GENCO II and other materials relevant to this line of inquiry.

Finally, it is apparent from Applicant's submission of the prior art *RMC, Ltd. Problem Solving & Decisions Making User's Guide, 1996*, that a computer program in existence at the time of the invention implemented all or part of the underlying process of the instant invention. The relationship of the assignee to the computer program is unclear. Given the vigilant defense of copyright evident by the above mentioned court proceedings and the possibility, by similarity to the instant invention, that a relationship may exist between the assignee and RMC, Ltd. it is reasonable to inquire as to whether the RMC software *PSDM 1.0 Problem Solving and Decision Making* is a product for use or sale by assignee or Applicant or agent of either, or a process licensed by Kepner-Tregoe then automated by RMC, or yet a third-party product with no relation to the assignee. Applicant is requested to clarify the relationship between itself and RMC, Ltd. with regard to the above-mentioned software, providing whatever documents or attestations necessary to clarify the record on this point.

Drawings

7. This application has been filed with informal drawings acceptable for examination purposes only. Formal drawings will be required when the application is allowed. Specifically, Applicant is requested to check all margins for compliance with Office requirements and to improve the legibility of screen prints of the graphical user interface where dark and uneven shading may obscure the text on publication.

Specification

8. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it contains 209 words. Abstracts are limited to 150 words. See MPEP § 608.01(b). Correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

9. The following is a quotation of the **second paragraph** of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

10. **Claims 4-111** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 4-111 recite a *process for eliciting, processing, storing, and displaying information concerning a complex business situation*. A process is a series of steps producing a result. Since the claims do not set forth any steps involved in the method/process, it is unclear what method/process applicant is intending to encompass. A claim is indefinite where it merely recites a use without any active, positive steps delimiting how this use is actually practiced. Claim 4 recites a collection of processes *employed or included* within a main process without reciting specific steps to be performed by the process to achieve a result. It is wholly unclear as

to what Applicant intends to encompass or how the process is actually practiced. Claim 58 is the computer program product of the process of claim 4. A computer program product performing a process must clearly recite the steps of the process performed by the elements of the program.

Claims 17 and 71 recite ...*the interactive GUI process screens containing substantially more explanatory text and transitioning more gradually than the worksheet mode*. The descriptors *substantially more* and *more gradually* render the claim indefinite in this context. The claim attempts to make a distinction between worksheet mode and interactive mode where the interactive mode operates in the familiar manner of a *help* or *installation "wizard"* common to Microsoft Windows applications. Claims 18-19 and 72-73 recite that the GUI process screens include *information on the preceding/following screens*, but it is not evident whether this is the information containing *substantially more text* delivered by *transitioning more gradually* as recited in the claims 17 and 71. Clarification is required.

Claims 17-20 and 71-74 recite an *interactive mode*. The specification recites an *interview mode*. As most graphical user interfaces are interactive, *interview mode* is precise and consistent with the specification. Correction is required.

Claims 31-34 and 85-88 recite the limitation *wherein the associated data...* There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. It is unclear as to what *associated data* in the limitation refers. Clarification is required.

Claims 46-49 recite *retrieving actions from analysis processes carried out for other complex business situations or by other users within an enterprise*. However, this is inconsistent with the specification or unclear as recited. The present invention is disclosed as being able to load actions entered and assigned into the worksheet fields of the action tracker during

Art Unit: 3623

performance of an analysis process. The *retrieval of actions* can only be the retrieval of the action attributes. But *retrieving actions...carried out...or by other users within an enterprise* is not described in the specification such that one can discern whether these users are one and the same of those carrying out analyses using the invention. The specification suggests that *other users* are users not associated with the analyses carried out by the invention, for example, when actions are assigned and emailed to *other users*. Clarification and indication of support in the specification, if necessary to Applicants' interpretation, is required.

The remaining claims are dependent on base claims rejected above, without repair of the deficiencies and are thus similarly rejected.

11. The following is a quotation of the **first paragraph** of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

12. **Claims 37-40, 42, 50-51, 54-57 and 91-94, 96, 104-105, 108-111** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Applicant's preliminary amendment has introduced substantial new matter not found in the original disclosure.

As to claims 37-39 and 91-93, the specification fails to describe *graphical icons indicating cell-related status information*. Mention of *icons* is not found in the instant specification. Graphical icons indicating cell-related status information are not apparent in the GUI screen figures, and even if so, require written description.

As to claims 40 and 94, the specification fails to describe *a text editor component to enable the user to create notes...in association with the process*. Mention of a *text editor* or *text editor component* is not found in the instant specification.

As to claims 42 and 96, the specification fails to describe *generat[ing] slide presentations containing selected portions of the data*. Mention of *slides* or *slide presentations* is not found in the instant specification.

As to claims 50, 51, 104 and 105, the specification fails to describe *...enabl[ing] the user to select pre-customized GUI process screens from a previously developed approach....* Mention of *pre-customized GUI process screens* is not found in the instant specification. The claims suggest capture of prior processes or the pre-configuration of processes from a specific instance to be applied to a general problem. However, the specification is equally void of any concept of what one skilled in the art would refer to as a template or script to carry out a customized process. The specification discloses only that users may access data stored in the knowledge base from previous processes, not that they may select and execute *pre-customized GUI process screens from a previously developed approach*.

As to claims 54-57 and 108-111, the specification fails to adequately describe *...eliciting...and storing identifiers of participants...to assist the user in identifying people having knowledge about the complex business situation...* Mention of *eliciting and storing identifiers of participants* is not found in the instant specification. Identification of participants is found only in the context of identifying possible assignees of actions, but this list is not related to eliciting and storing identifiers of people having knowledge of the complex business situation.

Art Unit: 3623

Applicant's disclosure and/or written description fail to support all claims. Though lacking definition in the written description, the claims, for the purpose of examination will be applied over teachings drawn from prior art or from old and well-known concepts in the art as best understood from claims as recited. However, the application of art, even where the claimed subject matter appears understood as intended by Applicant, does not indicate that the subject matter is adequately disclosed. Adequate written description is required in all claimed elements, including such elements as may be presented in drawings.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

13. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

14. Claims 4-111 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed recitation of a use, without setting forth any steps involved in the process, results in an improper definition of a process, i.e., results in a claim which is not a proper process claim under 35 U.S.C. 101. See for example *Ex parte Dunki*, 153 USPQ 678 (Bd.App. 1967) and *Clinical Products, Ltd. v. Brenner*, 255 F. Supp. 131, 149 USPQ 475 (D.D.C. 1966). Applicant has described a main process as a set of processes without specifying any steps in the process, and lacking steps, the process fails to produce a result.

15. Claims 4-111 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 4 and 58, and their dependents, fail to produce a concrete and tangible result

Claim 4 defines a process as a set of processes without specifying any steps in the process. Claim 4 amounts to the manipulation of abstract ideas without achieving a concrete and

Art Unit: 3623

tangible result and as such is non-statutory. Claim 58 is a computer program product implementing the processes of claim 4 and fails to indicate steps toward a result of the underlying processes. The remaining claims are rejected as being dependent without repair of the deficiencies of the independent claims 4 and 58.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

16. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

17. **Claims 1-3** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over EDI (DECISION FOCUS® Software User's Guide, Executive Development, Inc. (EDI), 1995).

As to **claims 1**, EDI discloses an automated method for analyzing a complex business situation including gathering, processing, storing, and displaying information. EDI teaches a graphical user interface (see GUI screen shots throughout) for gathering, refining, and displaying data in a step-wise manner (through a series of GUI screens), and generating an action list (see page 36). However, EDI does not expressly teach *storing said data in an indexed and normalized form in a knowledge base adapted for structured query and retrieval in performing said steps of refining and generating*.

EDI teaches a computer program that collects and stores data representing user knowledge of a business problem or situation. It was well known in the art at the time of the invention (see Amado, US. Pat. 5,537,590 published 1996) that a knowledge base is a database and a database can be structured and indexed for efficient storage and retrieval, and further that a

Art Unit: 3623

relational database provides these features. In addition to the teachings of Amado on these points, Examiner takes Official Notice that it is old and well-known and accepted practice in relational database design to store data in at least 1st Normal Form, an initial normalization limiting a database attribute to a single value to achieve database efficiencies.

EDI may well store its data in a relational database, yet the details of implementation are not given in the DECISION FOCUS User Guide. However, EDI teaches implementation on a Microsoft Windows platform (see page 2) on which Microsoft Access, a relational database adapted for structured and indexed retrieval, would have been readily available. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to store the data of EDI in indexed and normalized form in a relational database such as Microsoft Access. To do so would have provided robust and efficient storage and structured query and retrieval of data, employing a readily available commercial off-the-shelf relational database system.

As to **claims 2 and 3**, a computer executing the automated method of claim 1 does so from a computer-readable medium and thus anticipates claim 2. The computer itself comprises the apparatus of claim 3. As such, these claims are similarly rejected over EDI.

18. **Claims 1-3** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over RMC, Ltd (PSDM 1.0 Problem Solving and Decision Making, Internal Renewal Management Centre (RMC, Ltd), 1996).

RMC, Ltd discloses an automated method and computer program of analyzing a complex business situation including gathering, processing, storing, and displaying information. RMC, Ltd teaches a graphical user interface (see GUI screen shots throughout) for gathering, refining, and displaying data in a step-wise manner (through a series of GUI screens), and generating an

Art Unit: 3623

action list (see GUI screen, end of series of screens, showing Action Steps). However, RMC, Ltd does not expressly teach *storing said data in an indexed and normalized form in a knowledge base adapted for structured query and retrieval in performing said steps of refining and generating*.

RMC, Ltd teaches a computer program that collects and stores data representing user knowledge of a business problem or situation. It was well known in the art at the time of the invention (see Amado, US. Pat. 5,537,590 published 1996) that a knowledge base is a database and a database can be structured and indexed for efficient storage and retrieval, and further that a relational database provides these features. In addition to the teachings of Amado on these points, Examiner takes Official Notice that it is old and well-known and accepted practice in relational database design to store data in at least 1st Normal Form, an initial normalization limiting a database attribute to a single value to achieve database efficiencies.

RMC, Ltd may well store its data in a relational database, yet the details of implementation are not given in the PSDM 1.0 User Guide. However, RMC, Ltd teaches implementation on a Microsoft Windows platform (see Start Menu button) on which Microsoft Access, a relational database adapted for structured and indexed retrieval, would have been readily available. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to store the data of RMC, Ltd in indexed and normalized form in a relational database such as Microsoft Access. To do so would have provided robust and efficient storage and structured query and retrieval of data, employing a readily available commercial off-the-shelf relational database system.

As to **claims 2 and 3**, a computer executing the automated method of claim 1 does so from a computer-readable medium and thus anticipates claim 2. The computer itself comprises the apparatus of claim 3. As such, these claims are similarly rejected over RMC, Ltd.

19. **Claims 4-111** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kepner-Tregoe (*Problem Solving and Decision Making*, combined references describing the manual process including "Workshop Briefings", "Instructors Manual", "Instructors Outline", and "Notes and Reference [Participants Guide]", copyright Kepner-Tregoe, 1965-1996) in view of RMC, Ltd (PSDM 1.0 Problem Solving and Decision Making, Internal Renewal Management Centre (RMC, Ltd), 1996). (Kepner-Tregoe and RMC, Ltd are Applicant-submitted prior art.)

In general, the invention automates the process of *eliciting, processing, storing, and displaying information concerning a complex business situation* as described in the combined references of Kepner-Tregoe including processes for situation appraisal, problem analysis, decision analysis, and potential side-effect analysis. By automation of the process on a general-purpose computer, Applicant replaces manual worksheets with GUI process screens and a knowledge base (a database) for storing the worksheet collected data.

Employing automation, Applicant claims in addition to the underlying process certain automation features not contemplated by the manual process, such as data entry validation, pop-up help text and graphical icons, email notification, and knowledge base queries by keyword. These are features common to automation not present in the manual process. However, the underlying process remains substantially as described in the references Kepner-Tregoe by the assignee of the instant invention Kepner-Tregoe. At issue then is whether the invention as

Art Unit: 3623

automated is 1) obvious over automation of a known manual process, and 2) whether the additional automation-enabled functions would be obvious to one of ordinary skill of the art.

As to **claim 4**, Kepner-Tregoe teaches the process of *eliciting, processing, storing, and displaying information concerning a complex business situation* including processes for situation appraisal, problem analysis, decision analysis, and potential side-effect analysis as described in the limitations (it is assumed that Applicant is familiar with the submitted works of the assignee). However, Kepner-Tregoe does not expressly teach *GUI process screens for eliciting and presenting data, a knowledge base providing for structured storage and retrieval of data, and an action tracking process storing attributes of each action including a responsible person, a deadline, and status*.

RMC, Ltd automates the process of eliciting, processing, storing, and displaying information concerning a complex business situation including processes for situation appraisal, problem analysis, decision analysis, and potential problem analysis. RMC, Ltd suggests and demonstrates GUI process screens in interview and worksheet modes (see numerous screen printouts showing worksheet data entry and series of GUI question/answer input screens). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to automate the manual process of Kepner-Tregoe in the manner of RMC, Ltd. Indeed, the makers of *PSDM 1.0 Problem Solving and Decision Making*, the computer program taught by RMC, Ltd, anticipated the claimed invention by the implemented of GUI process screens for eliciting and presenting data to the user. In doing so, RMC, Ltd provided the well-known advantages of interactive user input to a computer program for prompting the user for information as needed in the course of problem analysis or problem solving.

RMC, Ltd exemplifies automation of the manual process disclosed by Kepner-Tregoe including the GUI process screens. However, Kepner-Trègoe in view of RMC, Ltd does not expressly disclose *employing a knowledge base providing for structured storage and retrieval of data.*

RMC, Ltd teaches a computer program that collects and stores data representing user knowledge of a business problem or situation. It was well known in the art at the time of the invention (see Amado, US. Pat. 5,537,590 published 1996) that a knowledge base is a database and a database can be structured and indexed for efficient storage and retrieval, and further that a relational database provides these features.

RMC, Ltd may well store its data in a relational database, yet the details of implementation are not given in the PSDM 1.0 User Guide. However, RMC, Ltd teaches implementation on a Microsoft Windows platform (indicated by Start Menu button) on which Microsoft Access, a relational database adapted for structured and indexed retrieval, would have been readily available. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to store the data of RMC, Ltd in indexed and normalized form in a relational database such as Microsoft Access. To do so would have provided robust and efficient storage and structured query and retrieval of data, employing a readily available commercial off-the-shelf relational database system.

Finally, Applicant claims the following with regard to *an action tracking process*:

and the action tracker process includes

(i) retrieving and presenting actions from the other processes, and

(ii) eliciting, storing, retrieving and presenting attributes of the actions, the attributes of each action including a responsible person, a deadline, and status.

RMC, Ltd teaches action assignment in the last GUI screen of the sequence showing, in the table having headings **Action Steps**, **Who**, and **By When**, retrieving and presenting actions from other processes and presenting attributes of the actions including for each action (**Action Steps**), a person (**Who**), deadline (**By When**), and a check-box next to each action useable to indicate Status.

Kepner-Tregoe suggests such limitations on page 10 in the section "Additional Reference", the last section in "Notes and Reference [Participants Guide]" with a description of action assignment including WHO, WHAT, WHEN attributes for each action. The action attribute "status", while presumed present in RMC, Ltd does not appear to be suggested by Kepner-Tregoe. However, "status" is non-functional data and not accorded patentable weight. Nowhere in the specification does the action attribute "status" become a functional attribute. Rather "status" is a display datum indicating action progress (instant specification, page 36, lines 15-30), a datum for display and manipulation only that does not materially affect the process as disclosed.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to automate the manual process of Kepner-Tregoe in the manner of RMC, Ltd of adding an action tracker process. Indeed, it was obvious to the makers of *PSDM 1.0 Problem Solving and Decision Making*, the computer program taught by RMC, Ltd, at the time of the instant invention to implement the action tracking process suggested by Kepner-Tregoe. In doing so, RMC, Ltd provided the well-known advantage of using a computer for collecting and listing information on actions assigned to which persons and the deadline for completion.

Art Unit: 3623

As to **claims 5-8**, Kepner-Tregoe in view of RMC, Ltd teaches all of claim 4. However, Kepner-Tregoe in view of RMC, Ltd does not expressly teach performance support including help text, coaching, and examples.

With respect to claims 5-8, Examiner takes Official Notice that user performance support in the form of help screens, screen tips, and examples were old and well-known in the art at the time of the invention. RMC, Ltd suggests help screens provided upon indication of the user in the GUI screens showing a HELP button. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to provide help and examples on indication by the user. This would have assisted the user in carrying out the tasks in a more efficient and accurate manner.

As to **claims 9-16**, Kepner-Tregoe in view of RMC, Ltd teaches all of claim 4. However, Kepner-Tregoe in view of RMC, Ltd does not expressly teach data entry validation and invalid data notification including the ability to turn off validation.

With respect to claims 9-16, Examiner takes Official Notice that data validation and invalid data notification and preventing further input or advancement in the process including the turning off of data validation were old and well known in the art at the time of the invention. Kepner-Tregoe suggests such capability by emphasizing the importance of accurate and complete data collection in the manual process. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to provide data validation and user notifications to prevent invalid or incomplete data entry. This would have improved the results of the process by ensuring accurate and complete input of the data by each user. Turning off validation negates the

Art Unit: 3623

feature and would have allowed the user to proceed if the data validation was in error or if the user had incomplete data.

As to **claims 17-19**, Kepner-Tregoe in view of RMC, Ltd teaches all of claim 4 including interactive [interview] and worksheet mode GUI process screens. However, Kepner-Tregoe in view of RMC, Ltd does not expressly teach GUI process screens each summarizing a set of process steps to be performed (or performed previously) in the following/preceding process screen. Examiner takes Official Notice that it was old and well known in the art at the time of the invention to fashion GUI processes in the familiar manner of an *installation "wizard"* common to Microsoft Windows applications. Installation wizards routinely present a series of steps to be taken next (for example, software components to be installed), and summarize a series of choices made in previous screens (for example, software options selected for installation prior to initiating installation). RMC, Ltd suggests such feature in the disclosed progression of GUI process screens that elicit a series of selections and information inputs leading to an action strategy. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to design GUI process screens in such manner as succeeding and preceding process steps were displayed to the user. This would have provided confirmation and guidance to the user leading to more successful use of the computer program.

As to **claims 21-29**, Kepner-Tregoe in view of RMC, Ltd teaches all of claim 4. In addition Kepner-Tregoe teaches the specifics of claims 21-29 which detail the attributes of data such as "must" and "want", "is" and "is not" descriptions, etc. particular to data of each of the processes situation appraisal, problem analysis, decision analysis, and side-effect analysis.

Art Unit: 3623

These attributes are described in the combined works Kepner-Tregoe as should be familiar to Applicant.

As to **claims 30-34**, Kepner-Tregoe in view of RMC, Ltd teaches all of claim 4. Kepner-Tregoe in view of RMC, Ltd teaches the action tracking process as explained above in the pertinent section in claim 4 rejection. As the action tracking process disclosed in RMC, Ltd displays actions from the other processes (preceding action display), and as can be best understood by the claims (see 112 2nd paragraph rejection on antecedent basis of “associated data”), so also does Kepner-Tregoe in view of RMC, Ltd teach the limitations of claims 30-34.

As to **claims 36**, Kepner-Tregoe in view of RMC, Ltd teaches all of claim 4. In addition, RMC, Ltd teaches GUI process screens associating user entered data with the cells as indicated by the user.

As to **claim 40**, Kepner-Tregoe in view of RMC, Ltd teaches all of claim 4. In addition, RMC, Ltd teaches GUI process screens accepting text into user data entry fields. Entry of text into user data entry fields inherently involves some form of “text editor” to enter the text into the field and “edit” the text at least by the provision of a backspace-key function.

As to **claims 41-42**, Kepner-Tregoe in view of RMC, Ltd teaches all of claim 4. However, Kepner-Tregoe in view of RMC, Ltd does not expressly teach generating reports and slides from the knowledge. Examiner takes Official Notice that it was old and well known in the art at the time of the invention to generate reports and reports in the form of slides from a database of information. RMC, Ltd implicitly suggests such function because it collects information in an automated fashion and because information thus collected is commonly produced in communicable form such as reports and slides. It would have been obvious to one

Art Unit: 3623

of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to produce reports and reports in the form of slides from the knowledge base. This would have communicated more widely the information collected and analyzed to others interested in the results.

As to **claims 46-49**, Kepner-Tregoe in view of RMC, Ltd teaches all of claim 4 including the presentation of actions from past analysis processes. However, Kepner-Tregoe in view of RMC, Ltd does not expressly teach presenting the actions sorted by the header fields person, deadline, and status. Examiner takes Official Notice that it was old and well known in the art at the time of the invention to provide a tabular listing in a GUI element which inherently includes the ability to click on the header of each table column and have the results sorted by the attribute indicated by the header, for example, in the Microsoft Windows Access database listing of database records. RMC, Ltd implicitly suggests such function because it presents the action attributes in just such a table in a GUI element said to be implement in Microsoft Windows. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to sort by header field attribute. This would have listed the results in a manner grouping actions by person, arranging actions by nearest deadline, and status by action progress, enabling the user to conveniently focus on certain actions by person, need, or attention needed.

Conclusion

20. Claims 20, 35, 37-39, 43-45, 50-57 are not indicated as rejected over the prior art.

However, substantive issues have been raised regarding 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, and 35 U.S.C. 101, and thus have not been indicated as allowable herein.

21. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

FAGG et al teach prompting users with questions to complete a task including advice dynamically generated for assisting with questions and answers.

AMADO teaches generalized diagnostics knowledge base implemented as relational database including querying the knowledge base by keyword and production of reports.

BABBITT et al teach specialized decision support system for flight tutoring including pre-customized training scenarios.

Art Unit: 3623

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Dave Robertson** whose telephone number is (703) 306-5679. The examiner can normally be reached Mon 12:30p-8:30p T-Th 8:30a-8:30p Fri 8:30a-12:30p..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Tariq Hafiz** can be reached on (703) 305-9643.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the **Receptionist** at telephone number (703) 308-1113.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

- (703) 308-7687 [Official communications]
- (703) 308-7687 [After Final communications, labeled "Box AF"]
- (703) 746-5552 [Informal/draft communications, directly to Examiner, labeled "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT"]

Hand delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park 5, 2451 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, 7th floor receptionist.

dcr

May 20, 2002


JAMES P. TRAMMELL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600